

SERVICES FOR THE BLIND

Provided By

HEALTH - WELFARE - RECREATION AGENCIES

A Report of Services Rendered by Agencies Other  
Than Those Specializing in Work with The Blind

Division Report Series No. 5  
For the Health Division

Research Department  
Health and Welfare Council  
Philadelphia, Delaware, Montgomery Counties

January, 1959

HV1795  
.H43  
1959



**M.C. MIGEL LIBRARY  
AMERICAN PRINTING  
HOUSE FOR THE BLIND**

HV1795  
H  
cop1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Purpose, Scope and Method -----	1
II.	Findings -----	3
	A. Responses to the Questionnaire	
	B. Availability of Services for the Blind	
	Table I	
	Table II	
	C. Agencies Currently Serving the Blind ----	
	Table III	
	D. Agencies Serving the Blind Within the Last Three Years -----	8
	E. Prevention of Blindness Program	
	Table IV	
	F. Age Groups in Need of Additional Services	10
	G. Services in Need of Extension or Develop- ment	
	H. Responses by Types of Agencies	
III.	Conclusions -----	11
IV.	Responses by Types of Agencies -----	14
	A. Community Nursing Services	
	B. Cultural Facilities	
	C. Day Care Centers for Children	
	D. Educational Institutions	
	E. Family Agencies and Counseling Services	

TABLE OF CONTENTS  
(Continued)

IV. Responses by Types of Agencies (continued) --- 14

- F. Female Residences
- G. Financial Assistance by Voluntary Agencies
- H. Housing Agencies
- I. Institutional Care for Children
- J. Interracial and Intercultural Services
- K. Legal Aid Services
- L. Libraries
- M. Local Municipalities, Health and Recreation  
Departments, and Other Government Agencies
- N. Missions and Agencies for Homeless and  
Unattached
- O. Non-Institutional Care for Children
- P. Nursing, Convalescent and Boarding Homes
- Q. Other Agencies (Not Classified)
- R. Penal and Detention Institutions and  
Probation Services
- S. Research, Civic, Coordinating, Financing  
and Planning Organizations
- T. Resident and Day Camps
- U. Services for Handicapped and Vocational  
Rehabilitation
- V. Settlements and Neighborhood Centers
- W. Vocational Guidance
- X. Voluntary Health Associations and Health  
Promotion Agencies
- Y. Volunteer Services
- Z. Y's, Scouts, Boys Clubs, and Other  
Recreational Services

(Agencies Reporting Listed following  
each Section)

APPENDIX A ----- 52

APPENDIX B ----- 54



## I. Purpose, Scope and Method

This report is the first of a series of fact-finding documents to be issued as part of the Survey of Services for the Blind in the Tri-county region. The survey was initiated in the winter of 1957-1958 as a broad inquiry into the patterns of services and facilities available for blind persons resident of the region with the hope that improved services and programs would result. The background and reasons for the overall survey and the process developed in carrying it out are described elsewhere in reports of the Health Division.

The questionnaire developed for this particular part of the survey was designed to accomplish two purposes:

1. To locate blind individuals served by agencies in the area in order that additional information could be secured concerning their individual characteristics and
2. To provide a broad picture of the pattern of community services available to and provided for blind children and adults.

In addition to inquiring about services for, as well as outstanding needs of, the blind, it was deemed important to obtain some information concerning visually handicapped individuals. Accordingly, certain questions were asked about these persons. For purposes of this inquiry the following definitions were designed to provide responding agencies with common reference points:

Blind Persons, for the purposes of this questionnaire, will include children and adults who are totally blind, as well as those who only can perceive light, motion and form and those, who, with best possible correction, are able only to read large letters such as newspaper headlines (No more than 20/200 vision in the better eye with correcting glasses).

Visually Handicapped Persons, for the purpose of this questionnaire, will include children and adults whose vision, with best possible correction, remains the principal channel of learning and functioning, but who require the use of special facilities other than ordinary lensed glasses. (20/200 vision through 20/70 - Snellen System - with correcting glasses - at least 36% loss of vision in the better eye).

The questionnaire used in this inquiry (a copy of which is shown in the Appendix) was mailed to over 700 health, welfare, and recreation agencies and organizations in Delaware, Montgomery and Philadelphia counties. These organizations were, for the most part, those listed in the Directory of the Health and Welfare Council, Inc., but also included local libraries and municipalities in Delaware and Montgomery counties. A supplementary list of nursing and convalescent homes and homes for the aged provided by the Aging Division was also used. Follow-up letters and phone calls were numerous but cooperation, for the most part, was excellent.

The inclusion of visually handicapped as part of this inquiry resulted in little additional information; therefore, answers to questions concerning the visually handicapped are not included except as part of the summaries by category of agencies.

The findings are presented first in summary fashion below, for all types of agencies and then a separate section of results is presented for each major type of agency asked to respond to the questionnaire. Certain summary conclusions are presented early in the document with others found under each type of agency.

Some caution should be exercised in reading and interpreting the results which follow. The replies to some questions were in a number of instances somewhat obscure and a certain amount of interpretation of the answers was necessary merely to correct for internal consistency. Twenty-six categories or groupings of agencies were used primarily based on a functional approach with the problems involved in service to blind persons a significant factor considered. Another important consideration in grouping organizations was that they should be so categorized that the results would be meaningful. There was and is a problem concerning the placement of certain organizations which have multiple functions within the categories. No organization was placed in more than one category because of the confusion which would result from this kind of treatment. Also included in this phase of the survey were some organizations which performed little, if any, direct service. Where this is the case and evaluation of results is affected, it will be noted in the text. Finally, all specialized services and agencies for the blind were not included in this report since their programs are to be summarized and discussed in subsequent documents. A summary of number of blind persons served by the agencies and their characteristics will be presented in a separate report.



## II. Findings

### A. Responses to the Questionnaire

Table I shows the number of questionnaires sent and the number returned by agencies according to the twenty-six categories of agencies. Of the 724 questionnaires mailed to agencies, 602, or 83.1% were eventually returned. If the nursing, convalescent and homes for the aged are excluded the percent response to this inquiry increases to 91.4%. It is interesting to note that for nine categories 100% returns were received. The lowest percentage return is in the category of Legal Aid services but this is not significant in that only five organizations were solicited and there is valid reason to assume that several did not think that the questionnaire was applicable. Returns from nursing, convalescent and homes for the aged were also rather poor even after three follow-up letters and a telephone call. Only 68.2% of the solicited homes eventually reported. In all other categories at least an 80% return was obtained.

### B. Availability of Services for the Blind

The first question concerned availability of services to blind persons and was answered by all but thirty-five of the responding agencies and organizations. The total number of agencies which indicated that their services were available to blind individuals was 305 or 50.7% of the actual number of returns. (See Table II).

The responses in certain of the categories are more likely to be reliable than others, for example: the high percentage of agencies indicating that their services are available in the case of Community Nursing Services (92.9), Family Agencies and Counseling Services (100.0), and Legal Aid Services (100.0), seems valid in view of the answers and comments in the remainder of the questionnaire, as well as in view of the results indicated by other phases of the Study.

On the other hand five types of agencies showed a very low percentage of availability (all less than 12.5%); Day Care Centers for Children, Resident and Day Camps, Missions and Agencies for the Homeless and Unattached, Female Residences, and Institutional Care for Children. Some of the reasons given by these particular groups are of interest. Several of the missions indicated that they did not feel that they had facilities for caring for blind individuals and there was some suggestion that to care for blind was not part of their purpose. The overall impression given by the responses of





TABLE I

SUMMARY OF REPLIES TO QUESTIONNAIRE BY TYPE OF AGENCY

Type of Agency	No. Sent	No. Returned	% Response
TOTAL, All Agencies	724	602	83.1%
Community Nursing Services	15	14	93.3
Cultural Facilities	10	10	100.0
Day Care Centers for Children	23	21	91.0
Educational Institutions	11	10	90.9
Family Agencies and Counseling Services	9	9	100.0
Female Residences	8	8	100.0
Financial Assistance by Voluntary Agencies	22	21	95.5
Housing Agencies	5	5	100.0
Institutional Care for Children	44	39	88.6
Interracial and Intercultural Services	9	8	88.9
Legal Aid Services	5	3	60.0
Libraries	36	29	80.6
Local Municipalities, Health & Recreation Depts. & Other Gov't Agencies	45	41	91.1
Missions & Agencies for Homeless and Unattached	10	8	80.0
Non-institutional Care for Children	17	17	100.0
Nursing, Convalescent & Boarding Home	258	176	68.2
Other Agencies (Not Classified)	7	7	100.0
Penal & Detention Institutions & Probation Services	13	13	100.0
Research, Civic, Coordinating, Financing & Planning Organiz.	31	25	80.6
Resident and Day Camps	23	20	87.0
Services for Handicapped & Vocational Rehabilitation	16	16	100.0
Settlements and Neighborhood Centers	27	26	96.3
Vocational Guidance	7	7	100.0
Voluntary Health Associations and Health Promotion Agencies	25	24	96.0
Volunteer Services	11	10	90.9
"Y's", Scouts, Boys Clubs and Other Recreational Services	37	35	94.6

Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2017 with funding from  
American Printing House for the Blind, Inc.

TABLE II

AVAILABILITY OF SERVICES TO BLIND PERSONS BY TYPE OF AGENCY

Type of Agency	Total	Yes	No	No Reply	% Yes
TOTAL, All Agencies	602	305	262	35	50.7
Community Nursing Services	14	13	1	0	92.9
Cultural Facilities	10	3	7	0	30.0
Day Care Centers for Children	21	1	20	0	4.8
Educational Institutions	10	6	4	0	60.0
Family Agencies & Counseling Services	9	9	0	0	100.0
Female Residences	8	1	6	1	12.5
Financial Assistance by Voluntary Agencies	21	12	6	3	57.1
Housing Agencies	5	4	1	0	80.0
Institutional Care for Children	39	4	33	2	10.3
Interracial and Intercultural Services	8	4	4	0	50.0
Legal Aid Services	3	3	0	0	100.0
Libraries	29	6	16	7	20.7
Local Municipalities, Health and Recreation Depts. and Other Government Agencies	41	8	23	10	19.5
Missions and Agencies for Homeless and Unattached	8	1	6	1	12.5
Non-institutional Care for Children	17	11	5	1	64.7
Nursing, Convalescent and Boarding Homes	176	112	58	6	63.6
Other Agencies (Not Classified)	7	6	0	1	85.7
Penal and Detention Institutions and Probation Services	13	5	8	0	38.5
Research, Civic, Coordinating, Financing & Planning Organiz.	25	12	13	0	48.0
Resident and Day Camps	20	1	18	1	5.0
Services for Handicapped and Vocational Rehabilitation	16	9	7	0	56.3
Settlements and Neighborhood Centers	26	15	10	1	57.7
Vocational Guidance	7	3	4	0	42.9
Voluntary Health Associations and Health Promotion Agencies	24	22	2	0	91.7
Volunteer Services	10	6	4	0	60.0
"Y's", Scouts, Boys Clubs and Other Recreational Services	35	28	6	1	80.0

QUESTION: Are your agency services available for blind individuals?

12-20-1924

12001. 40 27TH ST. CHICAGO, ILL. 60640. TEL. 312/318-1151

[illegible]



the group of Day Care Centers and Nurseries was that they usually regard care of a blind child as a highly specialized problem with which they are not able to cope without special facilities and staff. An additional impression received was that there are some agencies within this group that are open-minded about the problem and perhaps receptive to innovation. Few of the agencies in the camping category have services available to blind or visually handicapped. The majority of these agencies appear to consider serving blind individuals also as a problem of special facilities and special staff.

The explanations offered by Female Residences and by those agencies offering Institutional Care for Children were much the same as in the case of the other categories.

Replies for other categories of service can be better understood in the light of comments made on the questionnaires. In the case of "libraries" lack of availability many times refers to the lack of space and limited budget for providing audiovisual aid and books in Braille. It also should be noted that the Library for the Blind in Philadelphia provides services to blind people throughout this area, as well as to those who live beyond it, and that both Braille and talking books are obtained through the mail or by phone. Two other categories, Local Municipalities, etc., and Research, Civic, Counseling, Financing and Planning Organizations, must have their responses evaluated in the light of the fact that they are primarily non-direct service agencies and that many of them interpreted the questionnaire as inapplicable. Some of the affirmative answers regarding availability were based on referral activity. In view of this, the responses of the non-direct service agencies are primarily of interest because of what they reflect of the subjective attitude of the respondent. In spite of some apparent confusion in answering the initial question, it is nevertheless surprising that some agencies in other categories indicated that their services were not available for the blind, such as five agencies providing non-institutional care, ten settlements, seven agencies providing vocational rehabilitation, or other services for the handicapped, and seven cultural facilities.

### C. Agencies Currently Serving the Blind

Table III reports the number of agencies currently serving one or more blind individuals in some capacity. One of the principal points to be noted is that there is a substantial decrease in the total number of agencies stating that they currently serve the blind, compared with the number of those who said that their services were available to blind individuals.

For example, only two of thirty-nine agencies providing institutional care for children reported currently serving blind children. This response seems to indicate that there is little provision for caring for blind and visually handicapped children who might need this type of service in non-specialized institutions. On the other hand, it is evident from the nature of other replies to the questionnaire, that there has been little demand made on these institutions to provide care for blind or visually handicapped youngsters.

Another revealing category is that of Cultural Facilities. Only one organization in the group is currently serving blind persons. This is the Allens Lane Art Center, which manifested a very affirmative approach about its program with blind individuals.

The Family agencies and Counseling services category shows that two-thirds of the agencies are serving blind people and ten of fourteen Community Nursing Services also are currently serving blind persons.

There is an important fact not revealed by Table III which must not be overlooked - namely that the actual number of blind persons served by the modest percentage of agencies "currently

(See next page for Table III)

TABLE III

TYPES OF AGENCIES CURRENTLY SERVING BLIND INDIVIDUALS

Type of Agency	Total	Yes	No	No Reply	% Yes
TOTAL, All Agencies	602	187	355	60	31.1
Community Nursing Services	14	10	4	0	71.4
Cultural Facilities	10	1	8	1	10.0
Day Care Centers for Children	21	0	21	0	0.0
Educational Institutions	10	4	5	1	40.0
Family Agencies and Counseling Services	9	6	3	0	66.7
Female Residences	8	1	5	2	12.5
Financial Assistance by Voluntary Agencies	21	4	10	7	19.0
Housing Agencies	5	4	1	0	80.0
Institutional Care for Children	39	2	36	1	5.1
Interracial and Intercultural Services	8	2	2	4	25.0
Legal Aid Services	3	1	2	0	33.3
Libraries	29	0	25	4	0.0
Local Municipalities, Health and Recreation Depts. and Other Government Agencies	41	5	20	16	12.2
Missions and Agencies for Homeless and Unattached	8	0	8	0	0.0
Non-institutional Care for Children	17	5	11	1	29.4
Nursing, Convalescent and Boarding Homes	176	89	76	11	50.6
Other Agencies (Not Classified)	7	5	1	1	71.4
Penal and Detention Institutions and Probation Services	13	3	9	1	23.1
Research, Civic, Coordinating, Financing and Planning Organiz.	25	7	15	3	28.0
Resident and Day Camps	20	1	19	0	5.0
Services for Handicapped and Vocational Rehabilitation	16	7	9	0	43.8
Settlements and Neighborhood Centers	26	7	19	0	26.9
Vocational Guidance	7	3	4	0	42.9
Voluntary Health Associations & Health Promotion Agencies	24	6	13	5	25.0
Volunteer Services	10	3	7	0	30.0
"Y's", Scouts, Boys Clubs and Other Recreational Services	35	11	22	2	31.4

QUESTION: Are you currently serving blind individuals?



1. 1946-1947 1948-1949 1950-1951 1952-1953 1954-1955 1956-1957 1958-1959 1960-1961 1962-1963 1964-1965 1966-1967 1968-1969 1970-1971 1972-1973 1974-1975 1976-1977 1978-1979 1980-1981 1982-1983 1984-1985 1986-1987 1988-1989 1990-1991 1992-1993 1994-1995 1996-1997 1998-1999 2000-2001 2002-2003 2004-2005 2006-2007 2008-2009 2010-2011 2012-2013 2014-2015 2016-2017 2018-2019 2020-2021 2022-2023 2024-2025 2026-2027 2028-2029 2030-2031 2032-2033 2034-2035 2036-2037 2038-2039 2040-2041 2042-2043 2044-2045 2046-2047 2048-2049 2050-2051 2052-2053 2054-2055 2056-2057 2058-2059 2060-2061 2062-2063 2064-2065 2066-2067 2068-2069 2070-2071 2072-2073 2074-2075 2076-2077 2078-2079 2080-2081 2082-2083 2084-2085 2086-2087 2088-2089 2090-2091 2092-2093 2094-2095 2096-2097 2098-2099 2100-2101 2102-2103 2104-2105 2106-2107 2108-2109 2110-2111 2112-2113 2114-2115 2116-2117 2118-2119 2120-2121 2122-2123 2124-2125 2126-2127 2128-2129 2130-2131 2132-2133 2134-2135 2136-2137 2138-2139 2140-2141 2142-2143 2144-2145 2146-2147 2148-2149 2150-2151 2152-2153 2154-2155 2156-2157 2158-2159 2160-2161 2162-2163 2164-2165 2166-2167 2168-2169 2170-2171 2172-2173 2174-2175 2176-2177 2178-2179 2180-2181 2182-2183 2184-2185 2186-2187 2188-2189 2190-2191 2192-2193 2194-2195 2196-2197 2198-2199 2200-2201 2202-2203 2204-2205 2206-2207 2208-2209 2210-2211 2212-2213 2214-2215 2216-2217 2218-2219 2220-2221 2222-2223 2224-2225 2226-2227 2228-2229 2230-2231 2232-2233 2234-2235 2236-2237 2238-2239 2240-2241 2242-2243 2244-2245 2246-2247 2248-2249 2250-2251 2252-2253 2254-2255 2256-2257 2258-2259 2260-2261 2262-2263 2264-2265 2266-2267 2268-2269 2270-2271 2272-2273 2274-2275 2276-2277 2278-2279 2280-2281 2282-2283 2284-2285 2286-2287 2288-2289 2290-2291 2292-2293 2294-2295 2296-2297 2298-2299 2300-2301 2302-2303 2304-2305 2306-2307 2308-2309 2310-2311 2312-2313 2314-2315 2316-2317 2318-2319 2320-2321 2322-2323 2324-2325 2326-2327 2328-2329 2330-2331 2332-2333 2334-2335 2336-2337 2338-2339 2340-2341 2342-2343 2344-2345 2346-2347 2348-2349 2350-2351 2352-2353 2354-2355 2356-2357 2358-2359 2360-2361 2362-2363 2364-2365 2366-2367 2368-2369 2370-2371 2372-2373 2374-2375 2376-2377 2378-2379 2380-2381 2382-2383 2384-2385 2386-2387 2388-2389 2390-2391 2392-2393 2394-2395 2396-2397 2398-2399 2400-2401 2402-2403 2404-2405 2406-2407 2408-2409 2410-2411 2412-2413 2414-2415 2416-2417 2418-2419 2420-2421 2422-2423 2424-2425 2426-2427 2428-2429 2430-2431 2432-2433 2434-2435 2436-2437 2438-2439 2440-2441 2442-2443 2444-2445 2446-2447 2448-2449 2450-2451 2452-2453 2454-2455 2456-2457 2458-2459 2460-2461 2462-2463 2464-2465 2466-2467 2468-2469 2470-2471 2472-2473 2474-2475 2476-2477 2478-2479 2480-2481 2482-2483 2484-2485 2486-2487 2488-2489 2490-2491

[illegible]



serving" is extremely small, consequently the measure of segregation suggested by the figures is even greater than is apparent. However, the fragmentary amount of service currently being provided by certain types of agencies is quite clear; nineteen of twenty camps not serving any blind persons, ten of twenty-one voluntary financial assistance agencies, all of the day care centers and "missions", twenty-two of thirty-five recreational agencies such as "Y's", scouts, boys clubs, and four of seven agencies providing care for the handicapped and vocational rehabilitation.

D. Agencies Serving the Blind Within the Last Three Years

The percentage of blind individuals served by the responding agencies in the last three years shows, as might be expected, a slight increase in a few categories over the percentages indicated in the preceding table which was concerned with blind individuals who are currently being served. Those categories in which there was any increase are the following: Non-institutional Care for Children; Community Nursing Services; Family Agencies and Counseling Services; Interracial and Intercultural Services; Legal Aid Services; Local Municipalities; Health and Recreation Departments and Other Government Agencies; Financial Assistance by Voluntary Agencies; Voluntary Health Associations and Health Promotion Agencies; "Y's" Scouts, Boys Clubs and Other Recreational Services; Settlements and Neighborhood Centers; Libraries; Cultural Facilities; Missions and Agencies for Homeless and Unattached. Because of the large number of agencies who did not reply to this question, the overall percentage increase between those indicating service in Table IV and those indicating current service in Table III is only 4.4%.

E. Prevention of Blindness Program (Question II)

Concerning prevention of blindness, the affirmative answers are speculative since no definition of a prevention of blindness program was provided any of the agencies, and it is reasonable to assume this may have meant very different things to the various organizations. Of the total number only nine of the twenty-six categories probably should have considered the question at all, and only the answers of this group are considered here. Of the agencies included in Institutional Care for Children, only one out of thirty-nine indicated that it had a program for prevention of blindness; for Community Nursing Services, the figure was four out of fourteen; for Services for Handicapped and Vocational Rehabilitation, the figure is only one out of sixteen. In the category of Research, Civic, Coordinating, Financing and Planning Organizations, one out of twenty-five, and for Local Municipalities, Health and Recreation Departments and Other Government Agencies, three out of



TABLE IV

TYPES OF AGENCIES WHICH HAVE SERVED BLIND INDIVIDUALS  
WITHIN THE PAST THREE YEARS

Type of Agency	Total	Yes	No	No Reply	% Yes
TOTAL, All Agencies	602	214	202	186	35.5
Community Nursing Services	14	12	0	2	85.7
Cultural Facilities	10	2	6	2	20.0
Day Care Centers for Children	21	0	10	11	0.0
Educational Institutions	10	4	2	4	40.0
Family Agencies and Counseling Services	9	8	0	1	88.9
Female Residences	8	1	2	5	12.5
Financial Assistance by Voluntary Agencies	21	7	3	11	33.3
Housing Agencies	5	4	1	0	80.0
Institutional Care for Children	39	2	27	10	5.1
Interracial and Intercultural Services	8	3	1	4	37.5
Legal Aid Services	3	2	1	0	66.7
Libraries	29	1	20	8	3.4
Local Municipalities, Health and Recreation Depts. and Other Government Agencies	41	6	11	24	14.6
Missions and Agencies for Homeless and Unattached	8	2	4	2	25.0
Non-institutional Care for Children	17	7	9	1	41.2
Nursing, Convalescent & Boarding Homes	176	89	32	55	50.6
Other Agencies (Not Classified)	7	5	0	2	71.4
Penal & Detention Institutions & Probation Services	13	3	8	2	23.1
Research, Civic, Coordinating, Financing & Planning Organiz.	25	7	13	5	28.0
Resident and Day Camps	20	1	17	2	5.0
Services for Handicapped & Vocational Rehabilitation	16	7	4	5	43.8
Settlements & Neighborhood Centers	26	8	10	8	30.8
Vocational Guidance	7	3	2	2	42.9
Voluntary Health Associations & Health Promotion Agencies	24	9	9	6	37.5
Volunteer Services	10	4	2	4	40.0
"Y's", Scouts, Boys Clubs and Other Recreational Services	35	17	8	10	48.6

QUESTION: To your knowledge has your agency served blind individuals within the past three years?



... ..  
... ..  
... ..  
... ..



forty-one indicated some type of effort was being made. For "Y's", Scouts, Boys Clubs and Other Recreational Services, the figure is two out of thirty-five. Of the Educational Institutions included in the study, only two out of ten have such a program. Eight of the homes included in the category of Nursing, Convalescent and Boarding Homes, which consisted of 176, answered the question affirmatively. Two out of thirteen organizations in the category of Penal and Detention Institutions and Probation Services stated they had a prevention of blindness program.

Out of the total group of agencies considered, only twenty-four out of 369, or 6.5%, checked "Yes" to this question. As already noted, this figure may actually be somewhat misleading because of liberal interpretation on the part of the responding organizations.

#### F. Age Groups in Need of Additional Services

Concerning the question of opinion as to the age group which most urgently needed services given, 505 agencies did not answer the question. Of those that did, the largest number checked as "Urgent" services to the aged. Next was service to the pre-school blind, followed by school age blind, leaving adult blind with the smallest number of agencies indicating this group to be urgently in need of service. The impression given by these figures, however, is counteracted somewhat by the number of agencies who checked "Not Needed" in the various categories. The largest number noted was for the school age blind group. The other three groups received approximately the same number of negative checks. In the "Not Urgent" column, the figures for all four groups are approximately the same. The total percentage of agencies which replied to this question was only 16.3% of all agencies returning the questionnaire.

#### G. Services in Need of Extension or Development

In the final question on the questionnaire, agencies were asked their opinion concerning what service or services most needed extension or development within the study area. A substantial majority of the agencies replying to the questionnaire either did not answer the question, stated they had no opinion, or did not feel qualified to answer. Among the more interesting suggestions were the following:

A surprising number of the answers indicated a need for some sort of center which would provide information regarding available facilities for blind people within the community and which would also function as a coordinating and integrating body for such services. Also mentioned several times was the need for more

facilities for retarded visually handicapped children. A large number suggested an extended program for prevention of blindness including regular eye examinations and the like. A further area in which interest seemed to be shown was rehabilitation training and employment opportunities for blind people.

These and similar comments pointed up what was a rather common denominator in all the comments, namely: emphasis on those aspects of service for blind which make for the best kind of social adjustment and normal integration within the sighted community.

Another suggestion of interest was the importance of family counseling for parents of blind children, particularly the pre-school group. The responses to this question are dealt with more fully in the individual summaries.

#### H. Responses by Types of Agencies

Additional material on each group of agencies is presented in Section IV. Conclusions contained in Section III are based on the general findings reported above as well as material found in Section IV.

### III. Conclusions

The overall conclusions which might validly be drawn from results of this first questionnaire which was sent to agencies other than those serving only the blind, are that a surprisingly large number of agencies concerned with the public's health, welfare and general recreational needs do not have services available for, and are not currently serving, blind individuals. Lack of knowledge concerning the needs of blind persons is indicated by the many unanswered questions on the returned questionnaires, as well as sketchy answers in many cases. This in turn suggests that the unavailability of services for the blind may, in part, be due to poor communication with this segment of the community as well as a lack of understanding of the needs of the blind person. Considerable interest is shown by some agencies which are not now providing any service, and the potential benefits which might follow from better communication between these agencies and specialized agencies serving the blind might profitably be pursued.

Other specific conclusions suggested by the responses are as follows:



1. Some of the agencies responding to the questionnaire offered suggestions which recommended as desirable the integration of blind individuals into regular community services. However, a much larger number of organizations suggested specifically that more employment, rehabilitation and recreational activities are needed without any clarification as to whether these should be services provided on a segregated or on an integrated basis.

2. The fact that many agencies reported few or no applications from blind persons for services is probably often due to lack of knowledge on the part of blind persons concerning the availability of service. In addition, the fact that some agencies serving the blind only provide a wide variety of services and attempt to meet the total needs of blind persons, also probably contributes to the dearth of applications to agencies serving the general community.

3. The question concerning urgency of extending community service for four distinct age groups revealed that from the point of view of the agencies, the need for services for "adult" blind are much less urgent than for preschool, school age and aged blind persons.

4. Basic maintenance needs (food, clothing, shelter) seem to be much less pronounced than other needs such as employment, rehabilitative measures, recreation, etc. This conclusion is based on the fact that few blind persons utilize voluntary financial aid agencies and missions. Blind persons are also found living in public housing units in each of the three counties as well as in 89 of 176 reporting nursing, convalescent or boarding homes for the aged. Further, few agencies indicated that basic maintenance needs of the blind are inadequate.

5. Employment and rehabilitation needs are stressed throughout. In virtually every category of service in which there is any expression of opinion on services needing development or extension, employment opportunities and/or rehabilitation facilities are mentioned. These are the needs primarily of "adult" blind persons.

6. Another frequently mentioned category of service thought to be important are services directed toward prevention of blindness. It is not always clear what is meant by this. Some organizations indicated, however, that emphasis on periodic eye examinations and proper optical aids were important. It should be noted that the expression "prevention of blindness" was not defined or interpreted in any way for the agencies who answered the questionnaire. It may well have been interpreted as varying

from a regular eye examination to an extensive program of dissemination of information.

7. The returns seem to indicate that the availability of recreational opportunities for blind persons as offered by the general recreational organizations are extremely limited. Some of the libraries which indicated a desire to cooperate in providing some service for the blind, had no facilities, and actually only 20.7% of those replying indicated that their services were available. Of settlements and neighborhood centers, whose function is largely recreational in nature, only 57.7% indicated availability of service, and only 26.9% currently serving the blind. Only about one-third of the organizations within the category of "cultural facilities" indicated that their services were available. Further, resident and day camps and day care centers have virtually no facilities to offer to blind children. The responses of the organizations within the category of Y's, Scouts, Boy's Clubs and other recreational services which indicated general availability of service, actually showed that only 31.4% of these agencies as currently serving blind individuals. It should also be noted that the few affirmative responses may indicate that only a very small number of blind persons are served by any given group.



#### IV. Responses by Types of Agencies

##### A. Community Nursing Services

Thirteen of the fourteen nursing services which responded stated that their services were available to blind individuals. The one nursing association which did not have services available to the blind said they were not equipped to perform such service. Four of the associations in this group indicated that they were engaged in a program directed toward the prevention of blindness.

Ten of the nursing groups are currently serving blind individuals and an additional one is serving visually handicapped persons. All but two of the responding agencies had served blind individuals within the past three years. Those not currently serving the blind explained that no blind person had applied.

Three replies checked as "urgent" services for pre-school children and three checked the same as "not urgent", while one checked "not needed". One agency checked need for services for school age children as "urgent", while two checked the same "not urgent" and two checked "not needed". Three checked "urgent" for adult blind, one checked "not urgent", and one checked "not needed". For aged, three checked "urgent", one checked "not urgent", and one checked "not needed".

Only four of the nursing services answered the question concerning services which are in need of extension. One stated that the following services and facilities should be expanded for the blind: provision for special equipment, such as blind syringes; transportation to clinics; housekeeping service; more talking machines; and training centers for the newly blind. Another association suggested that occupational therapy for the homebound blind patient, as well as planned recreation, needed extension. A third agency stressed financial aid and housekeeping and companionship, and a different view urged early recognition and diagnosis of visual defects in the newborn and premature infant.

For the visually handicapped, the Visiting Nurse Society of Philadelphia felt the following were in need of expansion: medical evaluation; financial assistance; transportation to and from clinics; program to adjust patient and family to progressing blindness; and facilities for free eye examinations. The opinions of two of the agencies with respect to visually handicapped were the same as for the blind, namely: occupational therapy for the homebound, planned recreation, financial aid, and housekeeping and companionship.

Agencies Reporting

Community Health and Civic Association  
Community Nursing Service of Chester and Vicinity  
Community Service of Lansdale and Vicinity  
Daughters of the Most Holy Redeemer  
Little Sisters of the Assumption  
Neighborhood League, Wayne  
North Penn Visiting Nurse Association  
Starr Centre Association  
Twin-Borough Nursing Association  
Upper Perkiomen Valley Community Nurse Agency  
Visiting Nurse Association of Conshohocken  
Visiting Nurse Association of Eastern Montgomery County  
Visiting Nurse Association of Philadelphia  
Visiting Nurse Association of Pottstown and Vicinity

B. Cultural Facilities

Ten Museums and art centers within the tri-county area replied. Of this group, two museums indicated that their facilities were available both to blind and visually handicapped persons. The Wagner Free Institute of Science, which offers courses in science to the public, indicated that lectures with experiments and illustrations could be made available, and also the University of Pennsylvania Museum demonstrated a willingness to serve blind and visually handicapped young people or adults in groups upon request.

The response of the Franklin Institute was particularly interesting. This organization does not offer any services directly to blind individuals, but does have a significant research service relating to the needs of the blind. In the bio-engineering section of their laboratory, techniques are being developed for measuring intra-ocular pressure and work is being done on a reading device for the partially sighted, the latter being an opaque projector which produces a magnified high contrast image. The Institute is also experimenting with guidance devices for the blind based on more "sophisticated principles" than that of the ordinary cane, as well as studying possible means for developing reading machines for the blind which would convert ordinary printed material into Braille.

Only one of the art centers indicated its services were available to blind persons. This was Allens Lane Art Center, which, of the ten agencies comprising this group, was the only one currently serving blind and visually handicapped people.

The reason given for the lack of availability was the same for all those replying with any reason at all, namely; that their services were not physically applicable to the blind and visually handicapped. Of the nine agencies which indicated they are not currently serving blind or visually handicapped, seven gave no reason for present lack of service. The two museums which indicated availability stated that no blind or visually handicapped persons had applied to them for service. The University Museum has served both blind and visually handicapped some time in the past three years.

Only two out of the ten groups responding expressed any opinion concerning the urgency of services for the blind or visually handicapped age group. One, Allens Lane Art Center, checked as "urgent" services to all four groups listed. The Wagner Free Institute of Science checked "not urgent" for all four groups.

The only organization which stated its opinion concerning the service for blind or visually handicapped persons most in need of extension in the community was Allens Lane Art Center. It replied that creative art experiences were needed for the self-enriching development of blind individuals.

#### Agencies Reporting

Academy of Natural Sciences  
Allens Lane Art Center  
Bryn Mawr Art Center  
Delaware County Historical Society  
Franklin Institute  
Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts  
Philadelphia Art Alliance  
Philadelphia Museum of Art  
University of Pennsylvania Museum  
Wagner Free Institute of Science

#### C. Day Care Centers for Children

Only one agency in the entire group of twenty-one agencies responding indicated that its services were available to the blind. Five agencies indicated that their services were available to the visually handicapped. None of the agencies replying to the questionnaire is currently serving blind, and only two were currently serving visually handicapped children. No agency in the group has served a blind child within the past three years.



Two day care centers checked as "urgent" the need of service for preschool children; another checked as "urgent" service for school children; a third checked as "urgent" the need for service to adults.

The suggested types of service most needing development in the study area were reported as group experience for preschool blind children, eye tests for preschool children, family counseling for parents of blind children, participation of blind in various activities.

Reasons given for lack of availability of service were primarily lack of physical facilities and number and training of staff; one agency also indicated that "the group situation" explained why they do not accept blind. One day care center stated it would give an application from a blind child careful attention and another said it would accept a blind child if it could fit into a group situation (although it checked its services as not available). The Board of Education Division which runs thirteen children's day care centers in the City of Philadelphia suggested that they might try to serve blind children if they received competent help. A noteworthy comment by a day care center which has served visually handicapped children was that it was done very successfully.

The only reason offered for lack of current services differing from those given for lack of availability was that there were no applications. Another agency indicated that if it knew the requirements of care for a blind child perhaps they could arrange to accept them.

#### Agencies Reporting

Associated Day Care Service  
Chester Day Nursery and Boarding Home  
Delaware County Child Day Care Association  
Downtown Children's Center  
Frankford Day Nursery, Inc.  
Holy Cross Lutheran Church Day Nursery  
Holy Name Day Nursery  
Jenkintown Day Nursery  
Lincoln Day Nursery  
Madonna House  
Mt. Carmel Day Care Center  
New Bethlehem Baptist Church Day Nursery  
Northern Hebrew Day Nursery  
Philadelphia Board of Education - Child Day Care Centers  
St. Anthony's de Padua's Day Nursery  
St. Anthony's Day Nursery for Boys and Girls

St. Gabriel's Day Nursery and Kindergarten  
St. Nicholas Day Nursery  
St. Simon's Day Mission Nursery  
Strawberry Mansion Day Care House  
Wharton Centre

#### D. Educational Institutions

Ten schools or school districts responded. Six indicated their services were available to the blind or visually handicapped individuals. Two schools stated they did have a program for prevention and correction of blindness. Four schools are currently serving both blind and visually handicapped and have served them within the past three years.

The reasons given for lack of availability of services were that it "was not the function of the organization" and "lack of facilities and trained teachers". There was considerable comment offered by the schools that said their services were available which indicated the extent of the service. One stated that it was an evening school open to everyone, regardless of handicap. One public school district indicated it was short on sight saving books, especially for the upper grades. Montgomery County school district indicated that it hoped to open a class for the blind in September of 1958. Another indicated that for visually handicapped, it had large type material, reading lenses, and other "sight saving" material. Comments made in response to the question regarding a program for prevention of blindness were that there were public health services for this. A nursing school indicated that special emphasis is placed on prevention of blindness in the nursing programs.

The reason given for not presently serving blind or visually handicapped which differed from those offered for lack of availability, was that no one applied. Concerning the group most needing services, one school checked "adult" as not "urgent", a second checked "pre-school" and "school" "not urgent", and another school indicated it thought "pre-school" and "school" groups "urgent". Finally, one checked "pre-school", "school" and "adult" as "urgent".

A suggestion for extension or development was as follows: "that other school districts should conduct programs similar to that of the Chester School District". Another suggestion made was that "there is need for adequately trained and certified teachers, and that there should be a coordinating program, one agency to coordinate programs of all other groups connected with this problem".

Agencies Reporting

Chester School District  
Delaware County Public Schools  
Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium of Pennsylvania:  
    Board of Christian Education  
Junto  
Hebrew Education Society of Philadelphia  
Methodist Church - The Philadelphia Conference Board of  
    Education  
Montgomery County Schools  
School of Nursing - University of Pennsylvania  
School of Social Work - University of Pennsylvania  
St. John's Night School

E. Family Agencies and Counseling Services

All nine agencies responding stated that their services are available to the blind and visually handicapped. Six are currently serving blind and five are currently serving visually handicapped persons. Reasons given by several agencies for not currently serving blind individuals was "none have applied."

Eight of the nine organizations have served blind individuals within the past three years, and seven out of eight have served visually handicapped.

In response to the question concerning urgency of need of different age groups, one agency checked as "not urgent" service for the adult blind.

Three agencies stated that the greatest need was for rehabilitation training and employment opportunities, and another indicated there was need for day care and homemaker facilities. There was also some comment on the need for guidance counseling for help in making social adjustments.

Agencies Reporting

Family Service of Delaware County  
Family Service of the Main Line  
Family Service of Philadelphia  
Family Service of Pottstown  
Florence Crittenden Home  
Jewish Family Service  
Lower Montgomery Family Service  
Marriage Council of Philadelphia  
Traveler's Aid Society of Philadelphia



#### F. Female Residences

Of the eight residences for women responding, only one indicated that its services were available to blind women. Six responded negatively, and one did not reply at all. For visually handicapped persons; three of the residences indicated their service is available.

Only one organization in this group is currently serving any blind women. None are currently serving visually handicapped. Only one has served a blind person within the past three years, and only one has served a visually handicapped person within the same period. There were no responses whatever to the question of urgency of extension and development of community services, although three of the organizations indicated that they had no basis from which to form a judgment. No opinions were expressed in response to what service was most in need of development.

The reasons given for the lack of availability of this service for the blind were much the same as those given by other organizations - "lack of facilities and personnel," which was expressed in several ways such as, a girl must be working at school or independent, the purpose of the organization is to be a residence for business women, the residence is a home for retired ladies. The only reason offered for lack of current service, which was not the same as those given for "lack of availability" was that "none (blind) had applied."

#### Agencies Reporting

Coles House - Young Women's Boarding Home Association  
Convent St. Catherine de Ricci  
Esther Hall  
Hostess House for Convalescent Girls  
Lucy Eaton Smith Residence (Dominican)  
R. Bennett Home for Woman and Girls  
Rebecca Gratz Club  
St. Regis House for Business Women

#### G. Financial Assistance by Voluntary Agencies

Twenty-one financial assistance organizations responded, twelve of whom indicated availability of services both to blind and visually handicapped individuals. Three organizations did not answer this question. Only four groups in this category are currently serving blind individuals, and visually handicapped persons. Within the past three years, seven agencies had served blind and four had served visually handicapped persons.

Several reasons given for lack of availability of services were that there "were no facilities", and "restricted to boys and girls in senior high school only."

Some comments in response to availability of service are worth noting. One agency indicated its services were available to anyone who needed them and that it worked with blind associations. Several organizations supplied clothing and linen to people who needed it, including institutions and organizations serving the blind.

Not one organization in the entire group answered the question which asked for an expression of an opinion concerning comparative urgency of extension of service to four different age groups.

Other comments were: There was inadequate clearance of policies of life insurance to determine available disability benefits; there should be publicity to reach those blind who are unaware of various services; there should be increased medical services for blind and visually handicapped individuals.

#### Agencies Reporting

Associated Charities - Norristown  
Chinese Christian Church and Center  
Female Hebrew Benevolent Society  
French Benevolent Society of Philadelphia  
Friends Charity Fuel Association  
German Society of Pennsylvania  
Independent Chevra Burial Society  
John Edgar Thompson Foundation  
Life Insurance Adjustment Bureau  
Mariner's Church and Seamen's Reading Room  
Navy Relief Society  
Needlework Guild of America  
Northern Chevra Kadisha  
Philadelphia Branch - Needlework Guild  
Prisoner's Family Welfare Association  
The Grandom Institution  
Union Benevolent Association  
Veterans Advisory Committee of Norristown and Vicinity  
Western Association of Ladies  
West Norriton Relief  
White-Williams Foundation

#### H. Housing Agencies

Returns were received from four housing authorities and one private housing association. All the public housing agencies stated that their services were available to the blind and visually handicapped who were otherwise eligible. All are, in fact, currently serving both blind and visually handicapped people. The one private housing association, in contrast with the replies received from the public housing authorities, expressed the view that the study questionnaire was not applicable to it. The only one of the group to express an opinion regarding urgency of extension of services was Montgomery County Housing Authority, which indicated extension of services to adult blind was "not urgent".

Three of the four housing authorities did express opinions concerning the type of service which most needed development or extension in the area. One stated that there should be some anticipation of the needs of the blind in the designing of certain public housing units. Another view was that there should be a service to take care of the personal needs of blind and visually handicapped persons who are eligible for low rent housing. The third opinion was that there was need for more information.

At present blind persons are living in various housing projects of the Public Housing Authorities in all three counties.

Numbers of blind and partially sighted persons residing in public housing in Philadelphia are as follows: forty adult blind, six blind children, and twenty-three partially blind adults.

#### Agencies Reporting

Chester Public Housing Authority  
Delaware County Housing Authority  
Montgomery County Housing Authority  
Octavia Hill Association  
Philadelphia Housing Authority

#### I. Institutional Care for Children

There are thirty-nine agencies reporting within this category. Of these, thirty-one are institutions which care for children who have no major physical or emotional problems; the remaining eight care for children who do have specific and significant physical and/or emotional or mental problems.



The combined total in both these groups of institutions which stated their services were available to blind children was four. Two did not reply to the question. Eight institutions affirmatively indicated availability when asked about visually handicapped. Again, two did not reply.

Out of the entire group, two agencies are currently serving blind children and three are giving service to visually handicapped youngsters. Two institutions have served blind children within the past three years and three have served visually handicapped children within the past three years.

The reasons given for lack of availability of service to blind children was the absence of suitable facilities or staff; the requirements for entrance precluded the possibility of admitting a blind child. More particularly, from the institutions which care for children with specific problems, the following: the home is restricted to mentally retarded children; orthopedic conditions kept population of institution at capacity; work with emotionally disturbed children and program is not geared to care for severely physically handicapped; services rendered to dependent neglected, emotionally disturbed. The only answer in response to the query concerning the lack of present service which differed from the above reasons was the absence of requests for service.

One organization within this category indicated that it has a prevention of blindness program.

There was little response to question concerning urgency of extension of service to various age groups. One institution checked as "urgent" extension of services to preschool, school age, adult and aged. Another checked "not needed" extension of services to all four groups. A third checked as "urgent" services to preschool and school age children. The remainder indicated they had no basis for an answer or merely omitted a reply.

In reply to the question of what service for blind or visually handicapped persons most needed developing, one institution expressed the opinion that it was training for children with a low intelligence quotient who are in O.B. (orthogenic backward) schools. Another felt that the service most needing extension was a program for prevention of blindness, including normal eye refractions and provision of glasses.

Agencies Reporting

Baptist Orphanage  
Bethany Orphan's Home  
Betty Bacharach Home  
Burd School for Girls  
Carson Valley School  
Catholic Home  
Catholic Home Shelter  
Children's Seashore House  
Church Farm School  
Downingtown Industrial and Agricultural School  
Downtown Jewish Orphans  
Ellis School for Girls  
Elwyn Training School  
Foulke and Long Institute for Orphan Girls  
Friends Home for Children  
Girard College  
Holy Providence School  
Home for Orphans of Odd Fellows  
Home of the Merciful Savior for Crippled Children  
Little Flower Institute  
Methodist Home for Children  
Milton Hershey School  
Northern Home for Children  
Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children  
Presbyterian Children's Village  
Robert Wood Industrial Home  
St. Barbara Day School  
St. Basil's Home  
St. John's Orphanage Asylum  
St. Joseph's-Gonzaga Home  
St. Joseph's House  
St. Margaret's Vocational School  
St. Mary's Home  
St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum  
Southern Home for Children  
Sunnycrest Farm for Boys  
Western Temporary Home  
Williamson Free School of Mechanical Trades  
Women's Christian Alliance

J. Interracial and Intercultural Services

Only eight organizations in this group responded. Four organizations indicated their services are available to the blind and visually handicapped. Two organizations are currently serving

the blind and visually handicapped, three served blind within the past three years, and two served visually handicapped within the past three years.

The reasons given for lack of availability of service by the four agencies who are not serving blind or visually handicapped persons are lack of facilities or the purpose of the agency. Among the organizations who indicated that services were available, the following comments were made: Help was given to people in connection with immigration or naturalization, or in connection with a waiver of the reading and writing requirements provided on medical evidence of the visually handicapped. The reasons given for lack of present service were that "none had applied", and that the "present caseload does not happen to include such persons."

The only additional comment made was that the service most needed in the community at the present time was one which aids a blind individual to become self-sufficient.

#### Agencies Reporting

Catholic Resettlement Council  
Council for Equal Job Opportunities  
English Speaking Union  
HIAS - Council Migration Service  
National Association for Advancement of Colored People  
National Conference on Christians and Jews  
Philadelphia Fellowship Commission  
Urban League of Philadelphia (formerly Armstrong Association)

#### K. Legal Aid Services

The Legal Aid Society of Philadelphia, the Montgomery County Bar Association, and the Delaware County Bar Association all responded affirmatively to the question of availability of services to blind and visually handicapped persons. Of the three groups, however, only the Legal Aid Society of Philadelphia is currently serving any blind individuals. The services of these groups are available to a blind or visually handicapped person in the same fashion that they would be available to someone who is sighted. The Delaware County Bar Association, as well as the Philadelphia Legal Aid Society, has served blind individuals within the past three years.

All three groups replied that they had no basis for any opinion with regard to the question concerning urgency of



services to different age groups of blind, nor did they reply to the question of the necessity of extension of any particular service. The reason given for the absence of current service by Montgomery and Delaware County Bar Associations was the absence of any applications.

#### Agencies Reporting

Delaware County Bar Association  
Legal Aid Society of Philadelphia  
Montgomery County Bar Association

#### L. Libraries

Of the twenty-nine libraries in the study area that responded to the questionnaire, six stated that their services were available to blind persons. It should be instantly noted that with the possible exception of one country library, and perhaps a library in Chester, that there are no special facilities offered by the libraries who said their services were available to blind individuals. What is apparently meant by availability in this instance, is that their regular books may be used by anybody in the community. The number checking availability increases to eight for the visually handicapped. One community library which checked availability for visually handicapped did not indicate its services were available for the blind, and it does have some books which are in large print. Some of the libraries indicated that they do make referrals to the library for the blind in Philadelphia or to the local association for the blind. There are no blind individuals currently being served by the libraries, and only three indicated that their services were currently being used by visually handicapped. One library had served a blind person within the past three years, three had served the visually handicapped within the past three years.

In response to question five, one answered that extension of services for all four groups of blind mentioned in the questionnaire was not needed, and a second library responded that "pre-school" need was "not urgent" "school" was "urgent", "adult" was "urgent" and aged was "not urgent". A third checked "urgent" for both adult and aged blind. Finally, one library checked "school" "adult" and "aged" as urgently in need of extension of services.

There was only one reply to the question of what service most needed developing. Publicity and free literature were suggested.

The explanation for lack of availability varied from smallness of the library and lack of space, to limited budget for providing audio-visual aids and books in Braille. The only comments explaining the absence of current service which differed from the above were that there had been no requests for such service. A number of the libraries expressed considerable interest in service for the blind as it relates to the library.

Agencies Reporting

Abington Library  
Ambler Public Library  
Ardmore Free Library  
Bucknell Public Library - Crozer Theological Seminary  
Collingdale Public Library  
Community Free Library  
Crozer Branch - Chester Library  
Darby Free Library  
Folcroft Free Library  
Glenolden Free Library  
Lansdale Public Library  
Lansdowne Public Library  
Lindsay Law Library  
Ludington Memorial Public Library  
Marcus Hook Public Library  
Marple Public Library  
Media Free Library  
Montgomery County Free Library  
Narberth Community Library  
Norristown Public Library  
North Wales Memorial Free Library  
Norwood Public Library  
Prospect Park Free Library  
Schwenksville Community Library  
Sharon Hill Library  
Springfield Public Library  
Swarthmore Public Library  
Upper Darby Free Library  
William Jeanes Memorial Library

M. Local Municipalities, Health and Recreation Departments,  
and Other Government Agencies

Of the forty-one organizations within this category, ten returned the questionnaire, but did not answer any of the questions; therefore, for purposes of summarizing information, these ten will be excluded. The inclusion of "Other Government Agencies" in this

category does not cover all the government agencies which responded to the questionnaire, but rather only those which did not more appropriately fit into another category.

Eight of those responding indicated that their services were available to the blind and visually handicapped. Three of the organizations have programs for prevention of blindness. Five are currently serving blind and visually handicapped and six have served blind and visually handicapped in the past three years. In response to the question of what age group most needs service, one reply was "not needed" all four groups; another, "not urgent" for adult and aged blind; and one, pre-school "urgent", school, adult and aged blind "not urgent".

The suggestions offered in reply to the inquiry concerning the type service which most needs developing were: "parent counseling service for parents of pre-school and school children", "classes for partially sighted children in the public schools of Delaware and Montgomery County", "preventive measures in early casefinding", "training (two organizations) programs so that blind may earn their own livelihood" and finally "recreation".

Some comments which accompanied the replies to the questionnaire were as follows: Three small local communities said that they had no services available to blind or visually handicapped because they were too small to have any such program for the blind. Several of the Borough offices replied that they did not know of any blind in their community. A few of the affirmative answers were based on referral activity of the local Borough.

The only other comment which seems significant was from the Department of Public Instruction of Pennsylvania. Their prevention of blindness program is "through improved standards in vision screening, improved school lighting and eye care in school health programs".

#### Agencies Reporting

Aston Township

Board of City Trusts - Philadelphia

Board of Health - Cheltenham

Board of Health - Collingdale

Board of Health - East Lansdowne

Board of Health - Haverford Township

Board of Health - Lower Merion Township

Board of Health - Pottstown

Board of Health - Tinicum

Board of Health - Borough of Aldan

Borough of Colwyn



Borough of Conshohocken  
Borough of Hatfield  
Borough of Narberth  
Borough of Norwood  
Borough of Norristown - Department of Health  
Borough of Ridley Park  
Borough of Telford  
City of Chester - Health Division  
Delaware County Orphan's Court  
Delaware County Park and Recreation Board  
Department of Public Health - Philadelphia  
Department of Recreation - Philadelphia  
Health Office - E. Greenville, Pennsylvania  
Health Officer - Springfield Township  
Maternal and Child Health Section - Philadelphia  
Nether Providence Township, Wallingford, Pennsylvania  
Pennsylvania Department of Health  
Pennsylvania Department of Public Assistance  
Pennsylvania Department of Public Instruction  
West Norriton Township

Agencies Which Returned Questionnaires, but Did Not  
Fill in Items

Board of Health - Lansdowne  
Borough of Ambler  
Borough of Collingdale  
Edgemont Township Board of Supervisors  
Health Department - Borough of Jenkintown  
Health Department - Lower Moreland Township  
Health Officer - Abington  
Health Officer - Rose Valley  
Health Officer - Souderton  
Upper Moreland Township

N. Missions and Agencies for Homeless and Unattached

Eight organizations replied, only one of which stated that its services were available to the blind. Three organizations stated that their services were available to the visually handicapped and one organization did not answer.

None of these organizations is currently serving blind persons; one is currently serving visually handicapped. Two have served blind persons within the past three years and two have served visually handicapped within the same period.

The reasons given for lack of availability of service are: "equipment does not lend itself to the care of the blind", "limited to dormitories on the third floor", "the purpose is the rehabilitation of alcoholics and not rehabilitation of the blind", "feel our shelter is not the proper place for them", and "lack of facilities". Despite the fact that services were not available to the blind generally, three agencies indicated they would not turn away a blind person if one would apply and that they had given temporary help to the blind in the past. One stated that it had served exceptional cases in the past, and that "if a blind person came in the middle of the night, they would be taken on temporarily". The only reason given for the lack of present service which differed from the above was that "none had applied".

In this group there is no present service being given to blind people, but regarding availability, the answers were so qualified that they tend to suggest that if blind individuals requested service of some of these organizations, they would not be turned away.

Only two of the eight agencies reported that services to adult and aged blind are urgently in need of extension. None of the agencies reported any information on services in need of development.

#### Agencies Reporting

Brotherhood Mission  
Chester Rescue Mission  
Galilee Mission  
John 5:24 Gospel Rescue Mission  
Seamen's Church Institute  
Sunday Breakfast Association  
Volunteers of America  
Whosoever Gospel Mission and Rescue Home

#### O. Non-Institutional Care for Children

In this group, seventeen organizations responded. Of these, eleven indicated their services were available to blind children, five stated that their services were not available, and one agency did not reply. Thirteen agencies in the group stated that their services were available to the visually handicapped; there were three negative replies, and the same agency again did not answer.

The total group of seventeen indicated that they were not engaged in any program directed toward the prevention of blind-

ness. Only five agencies stated they were currently serving blind children; eleven were not currently serving blind children, and one did not answer the question. Five agencies are currently serving visually handicapped, eight are not, and four did not answer. Seven agencies indicated that they had served blind children within the last three years and ten indicated that they had served visually handicapped within that same period.

Few gave reasons for lack of availability of service. One organization offered the opinion that in its placement program for disturbed adolescents, a blind child would be at too great a disadvantage. Two agencies whose function it is to find foster homes for children stated that they make their services available to a blind child if they can find a foster home for them, and that they would make every effort to do so. Some of the reasons given for lack of present service were that there have been no requests for service and that there was a limited shelter program.

Only three of the seventeen organizations responded to the question asking for opinion on the degree of urgency in extending services to the blind. One agency expressed the opinion that extension of services for preschool children and aged was "urgent", but "not urgent" for school children. Another replied that adult and aged urgently needed services and a third checked as "urgent" the need to extend services to preschool children and school children.

Only two organizations offered opinions concerning the type of service most needing development in the study area, suggesting that there be an extension of vocational and recreational services, more personalized training, and knowledge of new techniques and newly discovered optical helps; and a further opinion that additional facilities such as rehabilitation centers were needed, as well as preschool training for children and parents.

#### Agencies Reporting

Association for Jewish Children  
Baby Welfare Association of Philadelphia  
B'nai B'rith Youth Organization  
Bureau for Child Care  
Catholic Children's Bureau  
Child Care Service - Delaware County  
Children's Aid Society of Delaware County  
Children's Aid Society of Montgomery County  
Children's Aid Society of Pennsylvania - Phila. Bureau



Children's Service, Inc. - Philadelphia  
Home Missionary Child Care Society  
Orphan Society of Philadelphia  
Pennsylvania Society to Protect Children from Cruelty  
Philadelphia Child Guidance Clinic  
Philadelphia Society for Crippled Children and Adults  
Sheltering Arms  
Youth Services, Inc.

P. Nursing, Convalescent and Boarding Homes

A total of one hundred and seventy-six homes are included in this resume'. The number of homes who responded that their services were available to blind individuals was one hundred and twelve. Fifty-eight stated their services were not available and six did not answer. One hundred and seventeen homes have services available to visually handicapped; thirty-eight do not, and twenty-one did not answer the question. Several stated they would take blind only if there were room on the first floor.

Eight of these organizations indicated that they had something which, in their opinion, was a program for the prevention of blindness. The number of homes which are actually serving blind people at present is eighty-nine and those serving visually handicapped sixty-nine. Eleven did not answer the section concerning blind individuals, whereas forty-five did not reply to the inquiry as to whether or not they were serving visually handicapped. This is noted especially because the summary figure for those serving visually handicapped otherwise would be difficult to explain.

The figures for those homes who have served blind and visually handicapped in the past three years are: for blind - seventy-five who have, thirty-three who have not, and sixty-eight not replying; for visually handicapped - sixty-eight have, twenty-seven have not, and again a large number, eighty-one, not replying.

Very few, however, replied to the question concerning comparative urgency of an extension of community services. Fifteen of the organizations listed needs for preschool children as "urgent", fifteen listed needs of school children as "urgent", twenty-one checked needs of adult blind as "urgent", one indicated adult blind needs were "not urgent". Twenty homes marked the needs of aged blind as "urgent", six stated they were "not urgent", and four indicated there was no urgency for extension of services to aged blind.

The comments which were found in this group of questionnaires were not extensive. Twenty-five homes stated that they did not serve the blind because they did not have facilities to do so. There were also the following comments: custodial care was not provided, no bedrooms on the first floor, provisions of charter prohibited service to blind people. The only additional comments were that there had been no requests for service and there was no room.

The following suggestions were received concerning type of service most needing extension or development in the community: blind people should be helped to care for themselves; there should be more centers for rehabilitating the young blind adult; kindness, understanding and good nursing care; increase in amount of blind pension; more homes for the blind; occupational therapy; develop ability to read and travel by themselves; education; transportation and companionship at regular intervals; social service work; re-examination and re-evaluation of eye conditions so that wherever possible, help can be given; prevention; job rehabilitation and placement; and, finally, the comment that services for blind, visually handicapped and handicapped should be better integrated with services for the sighted.

#### Agencies Reporting

Abington Friends Home  
Agnew Convalescent Home  
Angeline Nursing Home  
Anglecote Sanatorium  
Arden Hall, Inc.  
Arnold Home for the Aged  
Artman Home for Lutherans  
Bair Convalescent Home  
Baker Home for Aged  
Baptist Home of Philadelphia  
Barclay Home  
Beck Convalescent Home  
Beidman Convalescent Home  
Bel-Lair Convalescent Home  
Bell's Convalescent Home  
Belvedere Convalescent Home  
Bethany Mennonite Home  
Bethward Manor Nursing Home  
Bishop White Convalescent Home  
Boykins Convalescent Home  
Brooks Convalescent Home  
Brookwood Retreat Home

Broomall Convalescent Home  
Brown Nursing Home  
Burke Convalescent Home  
Cedars of Tel-Aviv Convalescent Home  
Central City Nursing Home  
Chanuk Convalescent Home  
Charles Johnson Home (Montgomery County)  
Charles C. Knox Home  
Christ Church Hospital  
Christie Nursing Home  
Cliveden Nursing Home  
Conner Convalescent and Nursing Home  
Conner Williams Convalescent Home  
Cornelius Convalescent Home  
Crestview Convalescent Home  
Delp Convalescent Home  
Dixon Convalescent Home  
Down Town Jewish Home for the Aged  
Dowden Nursing Home  
Drueding Infirmary  
Dunwoody Home  
Eastern Mennonite Convalescent Home  
Eastern Mennonite Home  
Eastern Pennsylvania Eastern Star Home  
Edgemere Convalescent Home  
Elmwood Convalescent Home, Inc.  
Evangelical Home for the Aged  
Fair Acres Farm (Delaware County)  
Fairview Nursing Home of Bethlehem Pike  
Fairview Nursing Home of Paper Mill Road  
Francisville Convalescent Home  
Franklin Convalescent Home  
Fraser Home for Elderly Women  
Friends Boarding Home  
Garland Home  
Garrett Williamson Lodge  
George Nugent Home for Baptists  
Glenwood Nursing Home  
Goebel Convalescent Home  
Golden Years Home  
Green Acres, Inc.  
Green's Convalescent Home  
Greiser Boarding Home  
Greenhill Nursing Home  
Greystone Nursing Home  
Haines Nursing Home  
Hall Convalescent Home



Haring Convalescent Home  
Harston Nursing Home, Inc.  
Haskins Convalescent Home  
Hayes Mechanics Home, The  
Harned, The  
Healy Nursing Home  
High Oaks  
Highway Home for Aged  
Home of Divine Providence  
Home of Patriotic Order Sons of America  
Home for the Aged  
Home for the Jewish Aged  
Home for Veterans of the G.A.R.  
House of Rest for the Aged  
Houston Foundation  
Howell Nursing Home  
Indigent Widows and Single Womens' Society, etc.  
Inglewood Terrace  
Ivyridge Nursing Home  
Jenkins Nursing Home  
John C. Mercer Home  
Jo Lyn Hall Nursing Home  
Joseph Priestly House  
Kearney Convalescent Home  
Keene Home  
Kelsey Boarding Home  
King's Daughters and Sons of Pennsylvania  
Lakeside Nursing Home  
Landers Nursing Home  
Leamy Home  
Little Sisters of the Poor  
Lockwood Convalescent Home  
Locust House  
Lucien Moss Home  
Lurana Convalescent Home  
Lutheran Home for Orphans and Aged  
Lycoming House  
Margaret M. McFee Home  
Marwood Rest Home  
Mary S. Drexel Home  
Masonic Home of Pennsylvania  
Mennonite Home for the Aged  
Mercer Memorial House  
Messiah University Home  
Methodist Episcopal Home for the Aged  
Mosby Convalescent Home  
Mt. Sinai Holiness Church

Murphy's Boarding Home  
Murdoch Home  
Nazarene Home for the Aged  
Northern Baptist Home for the Aged  
Oak Hall Convalescent Home  
Oaks Nursing Home  
Oakwood Convalescent Home  
Old Man's Home of Philadelphia  
Orange Home, Inc.  
Park Lane for Convalescents., Inc.  
Park Pleasant  
Penn Asylum  
Pennsbury, The  
Perkins Convalescent Home  
Perry Convalescent Home.  
Philadelphia German Protestant Home  
Presbyterian Home for Aged Couples and Aged Men  
Presbyterian Home for Widows and Single Women  
Presser Foundation  
Red Men's Home of Pennsylvania  
Reformed Church Home for Aged  
Rest Haven  
Reyenthaler Memorial Home  
Richardson Convalescent Home  
Riddle Manor  
Riverview (Philadelphia Co.)  
Robinson Convalescent Home  
Rosemont Presbyterian Village  
Roslyn Convalescent Home  
Roxborough Home for Women  
Sacred Heart Manor  
St. Agnes Residence  
St. Ann's Widows' Home  
St. Anna's Home  
St. Francis Country House  
St. Ignatius Home for Aged  
St. Joseph's Manor  
St. Martha's House  
Sharon Hall Mgt., Inc.  
Smith Memorial Home, Inc.  
Solomon's Home  
Spring Fords Manor  
Spruce Nursing and Convalescent Home  
Stapeley Hall  
Stephen Smith Home for Aged  
Stith Rest Home  
Sunrise Rest Home

Tilden Home for Aged Couples  
Union Home for Old Ladies  
Uptown Home for Aged  
Vart-Hahn Nursing Home, Inc.  
Venango Convalescent Home  
Wahl Home  
Watkins Convalescent Home  
Willow Crest for Convalescents  
Willow Manor Rest Home  
Wise Rest Home for Aged  
Wissahickon Nursing Home  
Woman's National Evangelistic and Mission Conference, Inc.  
Workmen's Circle Home

Q. Other Agencies (Not Classified)

Seven agencies fall within this category, six of whom indicated they would serve blind individuals. The services of all seven agencies are available to the visually handicapped. None of the agencies within this category have any program directed toward the prevention of blindness.

Five of the agencies are currently serving blind individuals and six are currently serving visually handicapped. Within the past three years five of the agencies have served blind persons and six have served visually handicapped.

There was no response to the opinion question on extension and development of services.

Other than giving, in a few instances, an explanation of the kind of service blind people receive, no agency made any other specific comments. The Salvation Army did specify that its services are used by blind individuals as part of its welfare program, family service bureau, and religious services. The psychological clinics generally stated that they would serve blind but that none have applied.

Agencies Reporting

American Red Cross  
Delaware County Mental Hygiene Service  
Philadelphia Psychiatric Hospital Association  
Salvation Army - Philadelphia, Delaware & Montgomery  
Temple Psychological Clinic  
Tri-County-Mental Health Clinic  
U. S. Veterans Administration R. O. Medical Division



R. Penal and Detention Institutions and Probation Services

Thirteen organizations in this category responded to the questionnaire, five indicating that they might deal in one way or another with blind individuals and six indicating the same for visually handicapped. Delaware County prison and the Bureau of Correction, Camp Hill were the only institutions with some sort of prevention of blindness program.

Three organizations in this group noted that they were "currently serving" both blind and visually handicapped individuals. Three others explained that the lack of availability of service was due to not having a suitable program, and five others indicated substantially the same thing by noting that this was not a function of their agency.

Four of the five that indicated their services were available included the following qualifications: "if delinquent", "if sentenced or committed to Bureau's institutions;" "theoretically true, but unlikely that services will be needed", "if released on parole."

An additional reason was given by two groups for not currently serving, namely; that no blind or visually handicapped individuals had been committed to them.

In the area of opinion, one group checked "not urgent" for preschool and school children, "urgent" for "adult" and "aged". Another checked "urgent" for school children and adults, "not urgent" for "aged".

One organization expressed an opinion concerning the service most needing development; "public school facilities for children; rehabilitation resources that are directed towards employment for children and adults; adequate pension so that they may remain in own homes."

The five agencies indicating availability of service were all correctional groups of a governmental nature. The homes for delinquent children in this group regarded key problems related to blind as outside their proper function.

Agencies Reporting

Bureau of Correction - Camp Hill  
Delaware County Juvenile Court  
Delaware County Prison - Broadmeadows Farm

Home of Industry for Discharged Prisoners  
House of Good Shepherd  
Montgomery County Court House  
Pennsylvania Board of Parole  
Philadelphia Police Department  
Philadelphia Protectory for Boys  
Probation - Parole, Media  
Sleighton Farm School  
St. Joseph's School  
Tekawitha Hills School

S. Research, Civic, Coordinating, Financing and Planning Organizations

Twenty-five organizations classified in this category responded, twelve of whom indicated that they would serve both blind and visually handicapped individuals. Only one organization stated that it had any program for prevention of blindness. Of the twelve agencies who would serve the blind directly or indirectly, seven are currently serving blind individuals and visually handicapped, and have served them within the past three years. When considering the answers these organizations gave to questions one, three and four, problems of interpretation are involved. Most of these organizations are not direct service agencies and in some instances this may have prompted a "no" response to all three questions.

Opinions expressed by these organizations can be summarized as follows:

The question of what group most needed extension of service brought the same response from two organizations which checked "urgent" for all four groups. A third organization checked preschool "urgent", school "not urgent", and aged "urgent". There was little opinion with respect to what type of service most needs development. One agency thought it most important to educate the blind and visually handicapped to be self-supporting and to educate the public to provide more employment opportunities. Personalized training, knowledge of new techniques and optical helps were other expressed opinions.

Agencies Reporting

Allied Jewish Appeal  
American Friends Service Committee

Better Business Bureau  
Catholic Charities  
Chamber of Commerce of Philadelphia  
Citizen's Council on City Planning  
Community Chest and United Fund - Philadelphia  
Community Fund of Chester and Vicinity  
Delaware County Federation of Women's Clubs  
Evangelical Lutheran Ministerium - Board of Inner Missions  
Federation of Jewish Charities  
Greater Penn Valley United Community Campaign  
Greater Philadelphia Council of Churches  
League of Women Voters of Philadelphia  
National Jewish Welfare Board and USO  
Norristown Community Chest  
Pennsylvania Baptist Convention  
Pennsylvania Citizen's Association  
Pennsylvania Economy League (Bureau of Municipal Research)  
Pennsylvania League for Nursing  
Pennsylvania United Fund  
Philadelphia Baptist Association (Good Shepherd  
Ministry)  
Philadelphia Yearly Meeting of Friends, Social Service  
Committee  
Presbytery of Philadelphia  
United Fund of Norristown

T. Resident and Day Camps

Of the twenty camps serving residents of Delaware, Montgomery and Philadelphia Counties that responded, five were day camps for children. The remaining fourteen camps offered over-night accommodations for periods of one to ten weeks during the summer months, and offered programs varying in structure and type of activities. Although primarily intended for children under eighteen, at least one of these camps boards parents of children as well.

Of this entire group, only the Pines Summer Home for Women and Children, indicated that their services were available to blind persons, and one blind person was reported by the Pines Camp as currently receiving services. This camp is the only one listed which served blind persons during the past three years.



For the visually handicapped, one camp - the Variety Club Camp - in addition to the Pines camp mentioned above, reported their services as available. The Variety Club Camp reported that it currently served from five to ten persons under nineteen years who were visually handicapped. The Variety Club Camp and the Pines Camp are the only camps which reported serving visually handicapped during the past three years.

The reasons given by these agencies for unavailability of services to blind or visually handicapped are much alike. Nine camps replied that they did not have the appropriate facilities for caring for blind or visually handicapped persons. Four replies indicated that the camps were not physically suitable for visually handicapped due to such factors as rough terrain. Two camps stated they lacked the staff for these services. At the same time, two others indicated that their services could be made available to blind if they were accompanied by personal attendants. One camp declared that such services could not be made available for financial reasons.

Only four of the camps gave an additional reason for not currently serving blind or visually handicapped, namely that blind or visually handicapped persons had never applied to them.

When asked their opinions regarding the urgency of extension of community services for preschool blind, school-aged blind, adult blind, and aged blind, sixteen of the twenty camps indicated that they had no basis for opinion, or gave no response. Among the three camps answering, there was little agreement as to the urgency of extension of service to the respective age-groupings of blind or visually handicapped within the community. One camp mentioned need for extension of service to the school age blind as "urgent"; one other indicated that extension of services to preschool blind was "urgent", and a third cited preschool and school-aged blind extension of services "not needed", and extension of services to adult blind and aged blind as "not urgent".

In response to the question of what services most need development or extension within the Tri-county area, fifteen agencies indicated no opinion or stated that they did not feel qualified to answer on this subject. Two respondents suggested

that more attention be paid to services to visually handicapped persons. One camp mentioned a need for schools for the blind, another mentioned "occupational work", and a third mentioned the need to spread information to the public regarding needs and available facilities for the blind within the community.

Agencies Reporting

Alcott Vacation House  
Beth Judah of Logan  
B'rith Sholom  
Bryn Mawr Summer Day Camp  
Camp Rainbow  
Children's Country Week Association  
Christian Association, University of Pennsylvania  
(University Settlements)  
Delaware County Children's Camp Association  
(Camp Sunshine)  
Evangelical and Reformed Church, Department of Camps  
and Conferences  
Friends Camp Association (Camp Onas)  
Friends Central Summer Day Camp  
Golden Slipper Camp  
Har Zion Day Camp  
Mid-States Habonim Camping Association  
Pines Summer Home for Women and Children  
Pottstown Community Camp  
Radnor Summer Recreation Camp  
South Side Day Camp  
United Hebrew Schools and Camps  
Variety Club Camp

#### U. Services for Handicapped and Vocational Rehabilitation

Of sixteen organizations classified in this group and responding, nine indicated that their services are available to blind individuals and twelve indicated services are available to visually handicapped. Only one agency stated that it has a program for prevention of blindness. Seven of the nine organizations who indicated their services were available are currently serving blind people, and ten of the twelve checking availability to the visually handicapped are serving visually handicapped at present. An additional agency had served visually handicapped within the past three years.

There was only a small response to the question of comparative urgency of extending community services. Two agencies checked preschool and school age blind services as "urgent". Another agency checked adult as "urgent", a third checked preschool "urgent", school "not urgent", adult "urgent", aged "not needed".

Additional comments on services in need of development were:

"More sheltered workshop experience and employment opportunities"; "more imaginative vocational training and vocational objectives"; "more vocational training and more jobs". There also was comment that the methods used at present seemed quite adequate.

Remarks elicited concerning availability of service should be noted. Two of the agencies for the deaf stated that their services were for the deaf, the hard of hearing, and not for the blind. The Pennsylvania School for the Deaf has seven visually handicapped persons at the present time. This organization uses sight-saving material and in some cases Braille is being taught. Friends of the Deaf noted that they are serving two individuals who have tubular vision.

Of the rehabilitation agencies, one expressed an interest in the area of multiple handicaps in which blindness might be the primary or secondary problem and they are expanding their program. Another stated that it was not set up to give aid to blind or visually handicapped people, but they do lend radios, etc. to this group. Still another comment from one agency was that they would accept only cases where individuals would not accept their blindness and go to an agency for the blind or those who had additional physical handicaps.



Concerning reasons for lack of present service, one organization stated that there had been no referrals and the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation in Harrisburg stated that as a matter of Pennsylvania law, the State Council for the Blind is the state agency which was designated to cope with the rehabilitation of blind individuals in the Commonwealth.

#### Agencies Reporting

Archbishop Ryan Memorial Institute for the Deaf  
Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation, Harrisburg  
Catholic Center for Deaf and Hard of Hearing  
Central Rehabilitation Registry and Referral Service  
Chestnut Hill Rehabilitation Center  
Friends of the Deaf  
Goodwill Industries  
Pennsylvania Division of Special Education, Hearing and  
Speech Rehabilitation Center  
Pennsylvania School for the Deaf  
Pennsylvania Society for the Advancement of the Deaf  
Philadelphia Bureau of Rehabilitation  
Philadelphia Philanthropic Society  
Philadelphia Society for Better Hearing  
Shut-In Society  
University of Pennsylvania - Curative Workshop  
University of Pennsylvania - Department of Physical  
Medicine and Rehabilitation

#### V. Settlements and Neighborhood Centers

Twenty-six organizations in this group responded, fifteen indicating that their services are available to the blind. For visually handicapped, eighteen indicated services were available. None of these organizations sponsor or participate in a prevention of blindness program. Seven are currently serving blind individuals, ten are currently serving visually handicapped. Only one agency which is not currently serving blind and visually handicapped individuals indicated that it has served blind and visually handicapped individuals within the past three years.

Reasons given for lack of availability were that "there were no blind children known in the area", and, "facilities were not suitable and there is no professional or lay help". Additional comments were as follows:

"Services were available for blind, but there were no regularly scheduled activities for the blind." "Occasionally there was a visually handicapped person in an activities group." "Block organizations would involve the blind residents in the area." "Services are offered to physically handicapped." "There is no specific program for the blind." "Work of blind could be taken on consignment in craft shop." Two indicated that they served meals to "needy." Reasons given for lack of present services were that there were no blind people known and that none had applied.

Concerning urgency of services - one of the organizations checked preschool and school "urgent", and another checked "pre-school" and "school", as well as "adult" and "aged" as "not urgent." Other comments were as follows:

Recreation service in the homes for the aged is a needed service, as is the opportunity for enjoying normal participation in outdoor recreation. Another thought was that more talking books were needed. Comments were made that there should be services to integrate blind individuals into the community - to encourage them to live a normal life and finally that sufficient medical and recreational services deserved priority.

#### Agencies Reporting

Bedford Home Workshop (Bedford Street Mission)  
Beth Eden House  
Calvary Settlement  
Catholic Center for Puerto Ricans  
Chestnut Hill Community Center  
College Settlement, Philadelphia  
Fellowship House - Conshohocken  
Fellowship House - Philadelphia  
First Baptist Church Community Service  
Friends Neighborhood Guild  
Germantown Settlement  
Grace Settlement House  
Heritage House  
Jewish Community Center  
Kensington Neighborhood House of Richmond Soup Society  
Lutheran Social Mission  
Media Boy's Club  
Neighborhood Centre  
Norwegian Seamen's Church  
Philadelphia Center for Older People  
St. John Settlement House  
The Lighthouse



University Settlements (Christian Association of  
University of Pennsylvania)  
Robert Wade Neighborhood House  
West Philadelphia Jewish Community Center  
Reed Street Neighborhood

W. Vocational Guidance

Of the agencies grouped in this category only three out of seven replying stated that their services were available to the blind. In addition to these three, one stated that it would serve the visually handicapped. The same groups that indicated availability stated that they are currently serving blind and/or visually handicapped. The remaining responding agencies reported they did not have services available nor were they serving any blind or visually handicapped people. In addition, no blind or visually handicapped people had been served by them within the past three years.

Only two of the four agencies stating services were not available for blind or visually handicapped persons offered any reasons. Explanations given were that the agency's counseling or placement services were not geared to problems of the blind, there was little contact with the handicapped, the volunteers who worked for the agency were not equipped to cope with handicapped people.

One agency stated that, in its opinion, the need for services for all four age groups of blind and visually handicapped was "urgent". Two others checked the need for extension of services for blind adults as "urgent" and did not express an opinion with regard to the other groups. There were no other opinions given.

The Veterans Administration expressed the view that job placement was the service that most needs development in this area. One employment service stated that specialized, intensive job counseling and placement services were most needed in the area for visually handicapped while another specified rehabilitation programs including therapeutic workshops as the most important service requiring development.

Agencies Reporting

B'Nai B'rith Vocational Service  
Drexel Guidance (Drexel Institute)  
Ladies Depository of Philadelphia  
Jewish Employment and Vocational Service  
Pennsylvania State Employment Office  
Senior Guidance Council  
U.S. Veterans Administration (Education and Training)



X. Voluntary Health Associations and Health Promotion Agencies

Twenty-two of the twenty-four responding organizations classified in this category affirmatively indicated that their services were available to both blind and visually handicapped individuals. One agency explained that it did not provide any direct services and the other considered the questionnaire inapplicable.

None of the agencies within this group have any specific concern with prevention of blindness. Six organizations are currently serving blind individuals and nine are currently serving the visually handicapped; twelve are not serving blind and eight are not serving visually handicapped. As in other categories, some organizations did not reply to this question.

Nine of these organizations within the past three years have provided services to blind individuals and eleven within the past three years have had their services used by visually handicapped people. Of the remaining organizations replying to the question, nine have not served the blind within the past three years and six have not served visually handicapped.

Most organizations in this category did not express opinion on the extension and/or development of community services for blind and visually handicapped persons. One agency checked as "urgent" need for services to all four age groups of blind and visually handicapped and suggested that the service which most needs extension is case-finding and possibly more extended educational opportunities. Another organization indicated "not urgent" services for preschool and adult blind, "not needed" services for school age blind, and "urgent" services for aged blind, and job-training and sheltered workshops as the services most in need of development.

Philadelphia County Dental Society marked "urgent" needs of preschool and school age blind and felt more dental service, particularly for the homebound, was needed. One organization expressed the view that blind beggars should be taken off the street and put into some activity.

The usual pattern for the type of organization included in this group is that availability of services to a blind or visually handicapped person depends solely on how the individual relates to the purpose for which the organization was formed and the fact of blindness is incidental. The reasons, therefore, for not currently serving blind and visually handicapped were princi-

pally:

- (1) the limitation of serving only those afflicted with a specific disease or ailment which an organization was combating
- (2) no direct services were offered by many of the organizations in this group
- (3) the absence of application by a blind or visually handicapped person for help.

#### Agencies Reporting

Alcoholics Anonymous

American Cancer Society - Delaware County Unit

American Cancer Society - Philadelphia Division

Arthritis and Rheumatism Foundation, Eastern Pennsylvania Chapter

Delaware County Medical Society

Delaware County Tuberculosis and Health Association

Heart Association of Southeastern Pennsylvania

Mental Health Association of Southeastern Pennsylvania

Montgomery County Tuberculosis and Public Health Assoc.

Muscular Dystrophy Association of America, Inc., Philadelphia Chapter

National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, Delaware Co.

National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, Montgomery Co.

National Foundation for Infantile Paralysis, Philadelphia

National Multiple Sclerosis Society, Southeast Chapter

Nephrosis Foundation of Philadelphia

Pennsylvania Mental Health, Inc.

Pennsylvania Tuberculosis and Health Society

Philadelphia County Dental Society

Philadelphia County Medical Society

Philadelphia Mouth Hygiene Association

Philadelphia Tuberculosis and Health Association

Planned Parenthood Association

United Cerebral Palsy of Delaware County

United Cerebral Palsy of Philadelphia and Vicinity

#### Y. Volunteer Services

Ten organizations classified within this group responded, including the National Council of Jewish Women and three sub-divisions of that organization. In response to the question concerning availability of services, six organizations stated that their servic-



es, were available to the blind and the visually handicapped. Three of these organizations are currently serving blind and visually handicapped. The Philadelphia Chapter of the National Council of Jewish Women serves primarily in the capacity of readers, particularly for employed blind persons.

In response to the urgency of extending community services to the blind, two organizations indicated that services for all four age groups were urgent. Only two opinions were expressed in response to the query on development of services, namely: that hobbies and leisure-time activities should be extended, and that in-service training for staff working with the blind was also needed.

The kinds of work being done by these volunteer groups which do serve the blind include classes for instruction in transcribing material into Braille, volunteers for preschool blind at Overbrook School, hospital committees instructing convalescent patients in the use of Braille playing cards, and as already mentioned, reading to blind individuals. Other groups indicated that although they had no specific program of working with the blind, several of their members worked individually with blind people and there was interest in this kind of service.

#### Agencies Reporting

Bryn Mawr League  
Emergency Aid of Pennsylvania  
Junior League of Philadelphia  
Methodist Deaconess Home  
National Council of Jewish Women (Main Line)  
National Council of Jewish Women (Old York Road)  
National Council of Jewish Women (Philadelphia)  
National Council of Jewish Women (Wissahickon)  
Pennsylvania Hopetown Association, Inc.  
Servicemen's Center

#### Z. Y's, Scouts, Boys Clubs, and Other Recreational Services

A large number of the thirty-five agencies in this category indicated that their services were available to both blind and visually handicapped individuals; twenty-eight agencies with service available to blind and thirty-two for visually handicapped. Two organizations also stated that they had a program directed towards prevention of blindness.



Concerning current service, there was a sharp decrease in the number of agencies answering affirmatively eleven now serving blind and twelve serving visually handicapped persons. Seventeen organizations noted that they had served blind individuals within the past three years, and sixteen indicated they had served visually handicapped within the past three years.

The reasons given for services not being more generally available were frequently stated as follows:

Facilities are not adequate and staff is limited. One agency stated that services were "not available to any individual not potentially within the normal range of functioning." Many of the agencies which did check that their services were available called attention to some qualifications. In one instance the use of facilities was made available to schools or organizations for the blind. In another instance services were available but leadership would have to be provided. The by-laws of still another club allow it to accept blind membership up to 25%. One branch of the Y indicated that it gave swimming instructions to the blind in groups. Another branch of the Y said that there were many hazards to serving blind persons in their physical department, but that their lobby and social rooms were available. They could also arrange for a special exercise room, and finally that services were available if individuals could participate with a minimum amount of supervision.

The principal reason given for not currently serving blind or visually handicapped persons was that there had been no application or demand. Other reasons were that there were no facilities and no available leadership as well as lack of adequate program and the hazards involved.

There was not a large response to relative urgency of extending services to different age groups. One agency checked extension of service to school and aged blind as "urgent", another checked "urgent" for all four groups, a third stated the needs of preschool and school ages as "not urgent" and that those of adult and aged blind were "urgent". And one group checked "not urgent" for preschool, school blind, and adult blind. Other opinions expressed concerning the types of service which most needed development in the area were:

"Social gatherings", "blind taught to help themselves", "those who are old enough to be given work to make them self-supporting", "a referral service", "jobs", "education for prevention through periodic tests and examinations", "care and training of blind whatever age".



APPENDIX A

SCHEDULE I

COMMUNITY SERVICES AVAILABLE  
FOR BLIND INDIVIDUALS

Return to:  
Research Department  
Health & Welfare Council  
1617 Pennsylvania Blvd.  
Philadelphia 3, Pa.

I. Are your agency services available for:

\* (a) Blind individuals? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ If no, please give reasons.

(b) Visually handicapped persons? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ If no, please give reasons.

II. Is your agency currently engaged in any program directed toward the prevention of blindness? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_

III. Are you currently serving:

(a) Blind individuals? Yes \_\_\_\_ No. under Age 19 \_\_\_\_  
No. Age 19 and over \_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_ Because

(b) Visually handicapped? Yes \_\_\_\_ No. under Age 19 \_\_\_\_  
No. Age 19 and over \_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_ Because

IV. To your knowledge has your agency served within the past three years:

(a) Blind Individuals? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Unknown \_\_\_\_

(b) Visually handicapped? Yes \_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_ Unknown \_\_\_\_

V. Which statement best reflects your opinion as to the comparative urgency of an extension of community services for each of the following groups?

\* See definitions (as in text of report)



V. (continued)

	(a) <u>Blind</u>			(b) <u>Visually Handicapped</u>		
	<u>Urgent</u>	<u>Urgent</u>	Not <u>Needed</u>	<u>Urgent</u>	Not <u>Urgent</u>	Not <u>Needed</u>
Preschool						
Blind	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
School Age						
Blind	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Adult Blind	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Aged Blind	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
NO BASIS FOR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
OPINION	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

VI. What type of service do you feel most needs development or extension in Philadelphia, Montgomery and/or Delaware Counties

(a) For Blind Persons ?

(b) For Visually Handicapped Persons?

Signed \_\_\_\_\_ Name of Agency \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_ Address \_\_\_\_\_

---

If your answer to questions requires additional space, please use back of page.

# Health and Welfare Council

WILLIAM B. WALKER, President

C. F. McNEIL, Executive Director



HEADQUARTERS: 1617 PENNSYLVANIA BLVD., PHILADELPHIA 3, PA. • LOCUST 8-3750

## APPENDIX B

January 23, 1958

The Health and Welfare Council has been confronted for some time with various problems inherent in services to the blind and visually handicapped population in the Tri-County area.

The Council is vitally interested in developing a plan for a coordinated system of services to those who in any way have a serious visual difficulty.

Accordingly, a Study of Services and Facilities for the Blind and Visually Handicapped has been authorized by the Board of Directors of the Health and Welfare Council. Financing has made it possible to secure professional staff and expert consultant service.

As a first step, we want to secure information from a broad complex of health and welfare agencies to determine the many ways in which the community offers services to the blind and the visually handicapped.

We will be deeply grateful to you if you will fill out the enclosed Schedule and return it to Mrs. Helen Thatcher, Project Director, so that it reaches her no later than February 3, 1958.

We sincerely hope you will cooperate with us in this important task.

Sincerely,

DeLong Monahan, Chairman  
Committee for Study of Services  
for the Blind







